



JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

February 28, 2008

TO: Susan White, Mining Program Coordinator *AMOD*

FROM: Beth Erickson, Mining Engineer *BE*

Subject: Lisbon Valley Mining Co. Surety Reduction Request, M/037/088
Task #2206

Lisbon Valley Mining Company (LVMC) has submitted a request for a bond reduction of \$563,132.00. Due to missing data, lack of identified assumptions and explanations, evaluative inconsistencies, and lack of transparency in the final bond estimate spreadsheet received by the Division on Feb. 6, 2008, the requested reduction is not recommended.

A general overview of the discrepancies/inconsistencies is outlined as follows:

- Bond calculations include missing or inconsistent acreage
- Spreadsheet numbers do not ‘add up’
- No explanation of general or specific assumptions is provided
- No explanation of surety calculations is provided in the plan
- No approved bond scheme is provided in the plan

Due to the lack of demonstrative documentation, the dollar amount of the requested bond reduction cannot be verified. No explanation or outline documentation regarding the surety amount, surety details, or outline of surety plan has been found in the Notice of Intention. Important and necessary detail is lacking or missing in both the final bond estimate and in the current request for bond reduction.

It appears LVMC calculated a bond requirement based on an ultimate reclamation scenario as \$10,172,230 in 2009 dollars. The existing surety with the Division is \$6,076,888.00 *assumed* to be based on current reclamation obligation.



Further emphasis substantiating the denial is structured in terms of a scenario. There are several other bond categories that are being ignored in this scenario, with this scenario directed toward the heap/rinse category only. It is determined that heap/rinse is the highest reclamation cost risk based largely on lack of information.

The scenario is outlined below:

The ultimate reclamation obligation is determined to be \$10,722,230 based on information contained in the LVMC Final Bond Estimate spreadsheet. Due to an assumed bond scheme, the bond obligation is calculated at current reclamation obligation of \$6,076,880.00 as determined by LVMC. According to the LVMC current estimate, there is \$3,005,872.00 committed to heap/rinse work. This amount is 49% of the current reclamation obligation. Looking at the ultimate reclamation bond amount, the heap/rinse work obligation is 58% of the total ultimate surety. With full disturbance for each case, this percentage should be consistent.

Assigning 58% of the current reclamation obligation results in a heap/rinse amount of \$3,524,595.00. This increase of \$518,723.00 is less than the requested reduction amount but it is without consideration for unknowns and omissions.

Performing a range analysis using a 65th percentile, the dedicated bond for the LVMC current heap/rinse category should be \$4,358,514.00. This scenario alone is enough to deny the request for the surety reduction because of the number of unknowns associated with the heap/rinse. These unknowns include: reclamation details, category specifics, and rinse duration, among others.

In the ultimate vs. current case, the difference does not exceed the reduction request amount, however, once increased risk due to uncertainties is conservatively assigned, the required amount increases substantially in just one reclamation category.

With all the unknowns and uncertainty revolving around the heap/rinse category, a conservative estimate that includes risk should be established. It is in the best interest of the Division to determine an element of risk associated with each of the surety categories. The presented example was for only one of the five main categories (there are sub-categories as well).

To reduce risk factors, resolve inconsistencies, and improve reclamation bond calculation transparency, it will be necessary for the LVMC to satisfactorily identify and explain the full basis and scope of the bond scheme. The bond scheme should be substantially documented in the NOI including identification of category make-up, general and detailed assumptions, and the surety estimate. The operator should be required to provide a much more comprehensive spreadsheet with supporting

LVMC
Page 3 of 3
February 28, 2008

documentation before any future bond reduction requests are considered by the Division.

2008 Interim Bond Estimate
Lisbon Valley Mining Co
La Sal, Utah

Summo USA Corporation- Lisbon
 Valley Copper Project. Updated to
 reflect anticipated 06 and 07
 disturbance.

Anticipated %
 Complete Feb 1 Bond Requirement(in 2009
 2008 Dollars)

Based on Details of Final Reclamation
 original estimate prepared by The
 Winters Group 1997

ACTIVITY	AREA	QUANTITY UNITS	\$/Unit	1997 \$ Cost	2004 \$ Cost	2006 \$ Cost	2007 \$ Cost	2008 \$ Cost	2009 \$ Cost
Waste Dump A- 190 acres									
area of top	456,444	SY							
area of slope	462,580	SY							
scarily top (flat) area	456,444	SY 0.20	\$ 91,280	\$ 109,108	\$ 113,110	\$ 114,309	\$ 117,966	\$ 121,741	
12 inches soil on top of dump	152,148	CY 1.25	\$ 190,185	\$ 227,308	\$ 235,644	\$ 238,142	\$ 245,763	\$ 253,627	
12 inches soil on slope	154,227	CY 1.25	\$ 192,784	\$ 230,415	\$ 238,865	\$ 241,397	\$ 249,121	\$ 257,093	
seed entire surface	190	acre 174	\$ 33,080	\$ 59,513	\$ 40,962	\$ 41,396	\$ 42,721	\$ 44,088	
Total-waste dump "A" reclamation			\$ 507,318	\$ 606,344	\$ 628,581	\$ 635,244	\$ 655,572	\$ 676,550	0%
									0
Waste Dump B- 94 acres									
area of the top	197,222	SY							
area of the slope	258,240	SY							
scarily top (flat) area	197,222	SY 0.20	\$ 38,444	\$ 47,143	\$ 48,872	\$ 49,390	\$ 50,971	\$ 52,602	
12 inches soil on top of dump	65,741	CY 1.25	\$ 82,176	\$ 98,216	\$ 101,818	\$ 102,898	\$ 106,190	\$ 109,588	
12 inches soil on slope	86,080	CY 1.25	\$ 107,800	\$ 128,603	\$ 133,319	\$ 134,733	\$ 139,044	\$ 143,493	
seed entire surface	94	acre 174	\$ 16,358	\$ 19,549	\$ 20,286	\$ 20,480	\$ 21,138	\$ 21,812	
Total-waste dump "B" reclamation			\$ 245,576	\$ 293,511	\$ 304,275	\$ 307,501	\$ 317,341	\$ 327,496	40%
									130,998
Waste Dump C- 120 acres									
area of the top	344,222	SY							
area of the slope	238,633	SY							
scarily top (flat) area	344,222	SY 0.20	\$ 68,644	\$ 82,282	\$ 85,300	\$ 86,204	\$ 86,982	\$ 91,809	
12 inches soil on top of dump	114,741	CY 1.25	\$ 143,426	\$ 171,422	\$ 177,709	\$ 179,592	\$ 185,339	\$ 191,270	
12 inches soil on slope	79,544	CY 1.25	\$ 99,430	\$ 118,838	\$ 123,196	\$ 124,502	\$ 128,486	\$ 132,598	
seed entire surface	120	acre 174	\$ 20,660	\$ 24,956	\$ 25,871	\$ 26,145	\$ 26,982	\$ 27,845	
Total-waste dump "C" reclamation			\$ 332,580	\$ 397,498	\$ 412,076	\$ 416,444	\$ 429,770	\$ 443,523	100%
									443,523
Rinse Heap- 12% of total ore neutralized; rinsing & evaporation for 18 months									
lime (2.5 lbs/ton)(\$0.025/lb)(5.9M ton)	1,320,000	ton	0.063	\$ 63,160	\$ 99,392	\$ 103,038	\$ 104,130	\$ 107,462	\$ 110,901
labor, power & pump for drawdown & evaporation for 18 months	1	lot	\$ 99,926	\$ 99,926	\$ 119,431	\$ 123,811	\$ 125,124	\$ 129,128	\$ 133,260
Subtotal for heap rinse & evaporation			\$ 183,086	\$ 218,824	\$ 226,849	\$ 229,253	\$ 236,590	\$ 244,160	100%
									244,160
area of the top	578,976	SY							
area of the slope	81,719	SY							
12 inches clay cap on top	12	102,799	CY 2.50	\$ 481,998	\$ 578,081	\$ 597,208	\$ 603,538	\$ 622,852	\$ 642,783
12 inches clay cap on slope	12	27,712	CY 2.50	\$ 68,031	\$ 81,310	\$ 84,292	\$ 85,186	\$ 87,912	\$ 90,725
24 inch crushed rock on top	24	385,598	CY 2.50	\$ 963,995	\$ 1,152,162	\$ 1,194,416	\$ 1,207,077	\$ 1,245,703	\$ 1,285,566
24 inch crushed rock on slope	24	54,425	CY 2.50	\$ 136,062	\$ 162,621	\$ 166,585	\$ 170,372	\$ 175,824	\$ 181,450
12 inches soil on top	12	192,799	CY 1.25	\$ 240,999	\$ 288,041	\$ 296,604	\$ 301,769	\$ 311,428	\$ 321,391
12 inches soil on slope	12	27,212	CY 1.25	\$ 34,016	\$ 40,655	\$ 42,146	\$ 42,593	\$ 43,956	\$ 45,362
seed entire surface	178	acre 174	\$ 30,972	\$ 37,018	\$ 38,375	\$ 38,782	\$ 40,023	\$ 41,304	
Subtotal- clay, crushed rock, soil & seeding for leach pad			\$ 1,956,072	\$ 2,337,888	\$ 2,423,827	\$ 2,449,317	\$ 2,527,695	\$ 2,608,581	100%
									2,608,581
Reclamation of Miscellaneous Areas									
Pond Area- 11 Acres									
raffinate pond- 12 inches soil	4,853	CY 1.25	\$ 6,065	\$ 7,249	\$ 7,515	\$ 7,594	\$ 7,837	\$ 8,088	
PLS pond- 12 inches soil	4,852	CY 1.25	\$ 6,065	\$ 7,249	\$ 7,515	\$ 7,594	\$ 7,837	\$ 8,088	
ILS pond- 12 inches soil	4,852	CY 1.25	\$ 6,065	\$ 7,438	\$ 7,594	\$ 7,837	\$ 9,916	\$ 10,452	
water runoff pond- 12 inches soil	8,229	CY 1.25	\$ 10,286	\$ 12,984	\$ 12,745	\$ 12,880	\$ 13,292	\$ 13,717	
seed 4 pond areas	14	acre 174	\$ 2,436	\$ 2,911	\$ 3,018	\$ 3,050	\$ 3,148	\$ 3,249	
Total-Pond Area reclamation			\$ 30,917	\$ 37,139	\$ 38,387	\$ 38,856	\$ 42,031	\$ 43,594	100%
									43,594
Plant & Crusher Area- 28.6 Acres									
apply 12 inches soil	41,080	CY 1.25	\$ 51,350	\$ 61,373	\$ 63,624	\$ 64,298	\$ 66,356	\$ 68,479	
seed entire plant area	26	acre 174	\$ 4,437	\$ 5,303	\$ 5,498	\$ 5,556	\$ 5,734	\$ 5,917	
Total- Plant Area Reclamation			\$ 55,787	\$ 66,676	\$ 69,122	\$ 69,854	\$ 72,090	\$ 74,397	100%
									74,397
Haul Roads- 40 Acres									
scarily	192,889	SY 0.20	\$ 38,578	\$ 48,108	\$ 47,799	\$ 48,306	\$ 49,852	\$ 51,447	
contour	64,296	CY 1.25	\$ 80,370	\$ 96,058	\$ 99,581	\$ 100,636	\$ 103,857	\$ 107,180	
apply 12 inches soil	67,511	CY 1.25	\$ 84,389	\$ 100,861	\$ 104,560	\$ 105,669	\$ 109,050	\$ 112,540	
seed entire area	40	acre 174	\$ 6,960	\$ 8,319	\$ 8,624	\$ 8,715	\$ 8,994	\$ 9,282	
Total- Plant Reclamation Area			\$ 210,297	\$ 251,346	\$ 260,564	\$ 263,326	\$ 271,752	\$ 280,448	100%
									280,448
Power Line Corridor- 64 Acres									
note the power company has requested the line remain open	64	acre	n/a	\$ -					
Reseed Soil Stockpile Areas- 40 Acres									
reseed 40 acres	40	acre	174	\$ 6,960	\$ 8,319	\$ 8,624	\$ 8,715	\$ 8,994	\$ 9,282
Total- Reseed Soil Stock Pile Areas				\$ 6,960	\$ 8,319	\$ 8,624	\$ 8,715	\$ 8,994	\$ 9,282
33% 3,063									
Fences & Berms Around Open Pits									
fence around Sentinel Pit 1	5,620	LF 3.02	\$ 16,972	\$ 20,285	\$ 21,029	\$ 21,252	\$ 21,932	\$ 22,634	
fence around Sentinel Pit 2	2,140	LF 3.02	\$ 6,463	\$ 7,725	\$ 8,008	\$ 8,093	\$ 8,352	\$ 8,619	
fence around Centennial Pit	8,980	LF 3.02	\$ 27,120	\$ 32,414	\$ 33,802	\$ 33,859	\$ 35,045	\$ 36,167	
fence around GTO Pit	7,410	LF 3.02	\$ 22,378	\$ 26,746	\$ 27,727	\$ 28,021	\$ 28,918		